



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,349	09/30/2003	William E. Mazzara JR.	GP-304028 2760/134	5776

7590 12/19/2005

General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21
300 Renaissance Center
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

EXAMINER

PHUONG, DAI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2688

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,349

Applicant(s)

MAZZARA, WILLIAM E.

Examiner

Dai A. Phuong

Art Unit

2688

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed 09/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. However, dependent claims 4, 11 and 16 have been amended. Therefore, the dependent claims 4, 11 and 16 are rejected with new ground of rejection. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

Applicant, on page 1 of his response, argues that Myr presumes (or at least already knows) that a signal is a navigation query, and thus, Myr does not teach the necessity to parse the signal at the call center node to determine an inquiry. Additionally, Myr presume (or at least already knows) to access an information database to determine that short route to a destination, and thus Myr does not teach the need to access an information database based on the determination of the inquiry.

However, the examiner disagrees. The MGU client (user terminal) initiates a voice query signal or a request message to the CTU (server). The CTU (server) provides information or services to the MGU client (user terminal) bases on the voice query signal or request message. The applicant's attention is directed to the disclosure of the reference Myr, paragraph [0175] and [0185]. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myr by providing information or services according to a request message or voice query, since the technique described by Myr would perform equally well if operated at the system.

Applicant is advised to clearly define the term "compressed digital signal" and particularly point out how to parse the signal at the call center node to determine an inquiry.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-10, 12-14 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson et al. (U.S. 6,487,500) in view of Myr (Pub. No: 2001/0029425).

Regarding claim 1, Lemelson et al. disclose method for responding to digital vehicle requests, the method comprising: receiving a voice query by a telematics unit, wherein the telematics unit comprises at least one analog digital converter (col. 21, lines 11-16); converting the voice query to a compressed digital signal (col. 21, lines 11-16); transmitting the signal to a call center node 12 in communication with an information database via a wireless network (fig. 1, col. 21, lines 11-16). But, Lemelson et al. disclose method for responding to digital vehicle requests, the method comprising: parsing the signal at the call center node to determine an inquiry; accessing the information database based on the inquiry; formulating at least one response to the inquiry; transmitting the at least one formulated response in a digital format over the wireless network to the telematics unit; and translating the at least one formulated response to an analog format at the at least one analog digital converter.

In the same field of endeavor, Myr discloses method for responding to digital vehicle requests, the method comprising: parsing the signal at the call center node to determine an inquiry ([0062]. Specifically, Myr discloses on receiving a navigation query (Unit 11) from a

Art Unit: 2688

GSM Network driver/subscriber for a shortest route to a particular destination); accessing the information database based on the inquiry ([0062]. Specifically, Myr discloses the CTU applies an optimization procedure for computing an optimal route while making use of updated travel times for individual sections of roads) formulating at least one response to the inquiry ([0062]. Specifically, Myr discloses the optimal route is communicated to the MGU (Unit 10) via Internet /WAP protocol); transmitting the at least one formulated response in a digital format over the wireless network to the telematics unit ([0062]. Specifically, Myr discloses the optimal route is communicated to the MGU (Unit 10) via Internet /WAP protocol (Unit 8) and presented to the driver visually on the MGUs monitor (Unit 9) **configuration in digital map format**); and translating the at least one formulated response to an analog format at the at least one analog digital converter ([0062]. Specifically, Myr discloses the optimal route is communicated to the MGU (Unit 10) via Internet /WAP protocol (Unit 8) and presented to the driver visually on the MGUs monitor (Unit 9) **configuration in digital map format, and/or in audio form** through a sequence of voice instructions to GSM mobile clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle control and warning system of Lemelson et al. by specifically including parsing the signal at the call center node to determine an inquiry; accessing the information database based on the inquiry; formulating at least one response to the inquiry; transmitting the at least one formulated response in a digital format over the wireless network to the telematics unit; and translating the at least one formulated response to an analog format at the at least one analog digital converter, as taught by Myr, the motivation being in order to provide a

real time travel guidance system capable of handling a driver's request for a fastest route to any destination.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 1. Further, Myr discloses the method further comprising: optimizing the telematics unit for transmission of the voice query to a computer call center node ([0112]).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 1. Further, Myr discloses the method further comprising: transmitting the signal to the call center using a packet data connection ([0101]).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 1. Further, Myr disclose the method wherein transmitting the at least one formulated response in a digital format over the wireless network to the telematics unit comprises: transmitting the at least one formulated response in a digital streaming audio format ([0101]. Specifically, Myr discloses the navigation directions will be also be returned via TCP/IP protocol in form of digital map and driving Text/Voice instructions).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 1. Further, Lemelson et al. disclose the method wherein the analog digital converter further comprises a reversible digital analog converter (col. 21, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 1. Further, Myr disclose the method wherein transmitting information via the wireless network further comprises transmitting information via an Internet protocol ([0062]).

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1. However, the system includes the necessary software, hardware, firmware or a combination thereof to accomplish the stated task or functionality.

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2. However, the system includes the necessary software, hardware, firmware or a combination thereof to accomplish the stated task or functionality.

Regarding claim 12, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 8. However, the system includes the necessary software, hardware, firmware or a combination thereof to accomplish the stated task or functionality.

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7.

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 8.

4. Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson et al. (U.S. 6,487,500) in view of Myr (Pub. No: 2001/0029425) and further in view of Gladwin et al. (Pub. No: 2005/0003812).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 2. But, combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr do not disclose the method further comprising: filtering the received voice query before converting it to the digital signal.

In the same field of endeavor, Gladwin et al. disclose the method further comprising: filtering the received voice query before converting it to the digital signal (0370)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle control and warning system of the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr by specifically including filtering the received voice query before converting it to the digital signal, as taught by Gladwin et al., the motivation being in order to support multi media application features running on the server and wireless device.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set for in claim 3.

5. Claims 4, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson et al. (U.S. 6,487,500) in view of Myr (Pub. No: 2001/0029425) and further in view of Aoki et al. (Pub. No: 20010044315)

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr disclose all the limitation in claim 2. However, combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr do not disclose the method further comprising: compressing the voice query digital signal at the telematics unit, wherein a compression algorithm compresses the voice query signal at more than two times the compression ratio of human recognizable audio data compression, and wherein the formulated response is compressed to allow a user of the telematic unit to understand the formulated response.

In the same field of endeavor, Aoli et al. disclose the method further comprising: compressing the voice query digital signal at the telematics unit, wherein a compression algorithm compresses the voice query signal at more than two times the compression ratio of human recognizable audio data compression, and wherein the formulated response is compressed to allow a user of the telematic unit to understand the formulated response ([0050] to [0053]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle control and warning system of the combination of Lemelson et al. and Myr by specifically including disclose the method further comprising: compressing the voice query digital signal at the telematics unit, wherein a compression algorithm compresses the voice query signal at more than two times the compression ratio of human recognizable audio data compression, and wherein the formulated response is compressed to allow a user of the telematic unit to understand the formulated response, as taught by Aoki et al., the motivation being in order to performs data transmission using a packet of an appropriate length according to the detected vehicle traveling speed.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2688

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dai Phuong

AU: 2688

Date: 12-10-2005


GEORGE ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER